UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,561	03/02/2007	Maurizio Marchini	07040.0261-00000	8384
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			ROGERS, MARTIN K	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/19/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/579,561	MARCHINI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MARTIN ROGERS	1791				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	<u> </u>					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	<i>/</i>					
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>48-94</u> is/are pending in the application	1.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	· ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
8) Claim(s) 48-94 are subject to restriction and/or	8) Claim(s) <u>48-94</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	nte				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· 					

Application/Control Number: 10/579,561 Page 2

Art Unit: 1791

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 48-69, drawn to a method for curing a green tire.

Group II, claim(s) 70-94, drawn to an apparatus for curing a tire.

In the event that the invention of Group I is elected, Applicant must make an election from each of the following groups of species.

- A1. A species in which the protruding elements are ribs
- A2. A species in which the protruding elements are honeycombs.
- B1. A species in which the protruding elements are integral with the support.
- B2. A species in which the protruding elements are constructed separately from the support.
- C1. A species in which the pressing is carried out before heating.

C2. A species in which the pressing is carried out after heating.

C3. A species in which the pressing is carried out during heating.

Claims 48 and 51-69 are generic to the species of group A. Claims 48-51, and 55-68 are generic to the species of Group B. Claims 48-65 and 68 are generic to the species of Group C. Applicant is requested to elect a single species from each of the three groups above.

In the event that the invention of Group II is elected, Applicant must make an election from each of the following groups of species.

- D1. A species in which the protrusions are in the form of ribs.
- D2. A species in which the protrusions are in the form of honeycombs.
- E1. A species in which the protrusions are integral with the support.
- E2. A species in which the protrusions are constructed separately from the support.
- F1. A species in which the protrusions are non-interrupted.
- F2. A species in which the protrusions are interrupted.

Claims 70, 74-79, and 89-94 are generic to the species of Group D. Claims 70-73 and 77-94 are generic to the species of Group E. Claims 70-88 and 91-94 are generic to the Species of Group F. Applicant is requested to select a single species from each of the three groups above.

In the event that species D1 is elected, Applicant must make an election from the following group of Subspecies.

- G1. A subspecies in which the protrusions lie perpendicular to the equatorial plane of the support.
- G2. A subspecies in which the protrusions extend perpendicular to the circumferential direction.
- G3. A subspecies in which the protrusions extended parallel to the circumferential direction.
- G4. A subspecies in which the protrusions are inclined to the equatorial plane of the support.

In the event that subspecies G4 is elected, Applicant must further elect from the following group of subspecies.

- H1. A subspecies in which the angle of inclination is constant.
- H2. A subspecies in which the angle of inclination varies.

The species are independent or distinct because they lack unity of invention for the reasons set forth below. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, or a single grouping of patentably indistinct species, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species or a grouping of patentably indistinct species to be examined even though the requirement <u>may</u> be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species or grouping of patentably indistinct species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species or grouping of patentably indistinct species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species, or groupings of patentably indistinct species from which election is required, are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing them to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

EP 0893237 to Ogawa shows that the subject matter of clam 70 is old in the art. Ogawa discloses a sectional toroidal support (Figure 3: 11) with protrusions along its inner circumference (Figure 3: 15). The support is capable of the intended use of being used to manufacture a tire, the tire having an inner surface which matches the exterior surface of the support. Because the subject matter of the claim is old in the art, the claims cannot share a special technical feature and therefore lack unity of invention.

Page 7

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof.

Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.

Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARTIN ROGERS whose telephone number is 571-270-7002. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:30 to 5:00, and every other Friday, 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Martin Rogers/

/Richard Crispino/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791